## Galland, Kharasch, Greenberg, Fellman & Swirsky, P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Canal Square 1054 Thirty-First Street, NW Washington, DC 20007-4492 Telephone: 202/342-5200 Facsimile: 202/342-5219

RICHARD BAR
STEVEN JOHN FELLMAN 

EDWARD D. GREENBERG
WILLIAM F. KREBS 

DAVID K. MONROE 

REX E. REESE \*

TROY A. ROLF 

STUART M. SCHABES\*

DAVID P. STREET 

KEITH G. SWIRSKY 

KEVEN JOHN STEVEN 

KEITH G. SWIRSKY 

STEVEN STEVEN 

KEVEN STEVEN 

KEITH G. SWIRSKY 

KEVEN STEVEN 

KEVEN

KEVIN I. BABITZ 

KATHARINE V. FOSTER

ROBERT N. KHARASCH o JOHN CRAIG WELLER [] o

\* NOT ADMITTED IN DC ... NOT ADMITTED IN MD .. OF COUNSEL



OTHER OFFICES LOCATED IN:
MARYLAND AND MINNESOTA

GEORGE F. GALLAND (1910-1985)

Writer's Direct E-Mail Address EGREENBERG@GKGLAW.COM

Writer's Direct Dial Number 202- 342-5277

## **VIA FACSIMILE AND U.S. MAIL**

Mr. Vernon Williams, Secretary Office the Secretary Surface Transportation Board 1925 K Street, N.W., Room 700 Washington, D.C. 20423-0001 Office of Proceedings

JUN 07 2004

Part of Public Record

RE: Finance Docket 34192, Hi Tech Trans, LLC - - Petition for Declaratory Order - - Hudson County, NJ

211262

Finance Docket No. 34192 (Sub-No. 1)
Hi Tech Trans LLC - - Petition for Declaratory Order - - Rail Transload Facility at Oak Island Yard, Newark, NJ

211262

Dear Secretary Williams:

We are in receipt of letters dated May 5 and 19, 2004 from counsel for Hi Tech Trans, LLC ("Hi Tech") and May 5, 2004 from counsel for the Hudson County Improvement Authority and Essex County Utilities Authority ("Counties"), all of which relate to a court decision in *Grafton and Upton Railroad Company v. Town of Milford*, No. 03-40291-NMG (D. Mass. 2004). As it has pointed out on several previous occasions, the most recent of which was September 22, 2003, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection ("NJDEP") must again register its disagreement with these post-record submissions.

NJDEP does not intend to present additional argument addressing *Grafton and Upton* for several reasons. First, and contrary to Hi Tech's contention, the record in this proceeding makes it crystal clear that the facts at issue here are anything but the "mirror image" of the facts described by the judge in *Grafton and Upton*. Second, the Board can read court decisions as well as counsel for Hi Tech, and thus is able to comprehend the basis upon which the court reached its conclusions without yet another round of briefs from the parties in this case. Third, the Board is competent and authorized to determine the proper scope of the provisions of

## GALLAND, KHARASCH, GREENBERG, FELLMAN & SWIRSKY, P.C.

Mr. Vernon Williams, Secretary Office the Secretary Surface Transportation Board May 27, 2004 Page 2

49 U.S.C. § 10501(b) in this proceeding regardless of how a District Court may have ruled in an unrelated matter. Fourth, if parties were required to brief every preemption case pending before the Board and the courts *ad infinitum*, proceedings would never come to an end. Clearly, the Board's Rules of Practice do not contemplate or countenance any such procedure, and NJDEP objects to being placed in the position of having to continually respond to additional post-record submissions.

Accordingly, NJDEP requests that these submissions be rejected.

Respectfully submitted,

Edward D. Greenberg

Special Counsel for

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection

## EDG:kmd

cc: Honorable David M. Konschnik (via U.S. Mail) James A. Fletcher, Esq. (via U.S. Mail)

Benjamin Clarke, Esq. (via U.S. Mail) All other parties of record (via U.S. Mail)